G R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1907.

(Inward)

File No. 142

Serial Nos. 1—6

Papers Filed.

Month June 1909.

SUBJECT.

Memorial by Srinivasaiengar of Melkote complaining of the non-conduct of his sevarthas in the Bettada Narasimhaswamy temple.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES.

G.R.S. 1] 190 7.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Marginal)

NOTES.

File No. 142-07

FILE HEADING.

Non-conduct of certain Service offices by Srinivasiengar in the Bettadapura Narasimhaswamy temple at Melkote

From

The Private Secretary To H H the Maharaja

No. 6093 Dated 31-12-07 Received

Diary No. 2738	Enclos. -	Spare Copies -	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

73) forwards for disposal memorial from "Vembathi Seetha" Srinivasiengar of Melkote complaining of the non-conduct of his Service in the Bettadapura Narasimhaswamy temple at the place

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1/6,

82) The Dy. Commr, Mysore visits, Docket no 3272 Dy 14-1-08. forwards the above memorial for report.

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—30,000—3-4-07

Serial No. (3)

From

The Same officer,

Letter no 431 Dy 6th April 1908

Submits report on the above petition.

The Dy Commissioner's report goes fully into the facts of the case

It is reported as follows:—

The petrs. Seva of 5 Seers of Bongal in the Bettada narasimha Swamy temple had to be offered as usual, on 21st December 1904 and Contrary to manul, the Sarpathegar and the temple manegar in spite of Seshkar's instructions, allowed also the offer of one seer of Bongal Servartha by Shamanna. The petitioner thereupon complained to the Dy Amildar and the latter having satisfied himself personally that the complaint was not without reason, found that the Sarpathegar was primarily responsible for these irregularities and that the temple Shaka Diary of 20th Dece 1904 had been tampered with by the Seshka Sarpathegar and therefore

Flag W)

GPB—50,000—18-5-08

Serial No.

furnished him with a fine of Rs 4.
The Dy. Commr having called for the connected records, the Dy Builder obtained a Statement from the Petr To the effect that no further action need be taken as the Parpathegar had already been punished. The Dy Commr observes that the punishment is light considering the gravity of the offence - the tampering of a public record, that the conduct of the manager and the Parpathegar is highly reprehensible and states that he proposes to issue orders to the Sub Divisional officer to dispose of this suit. He solicits sanction to place the Parpathegar under suspension pending the final disposal of the case-

141 Do,

The same officer,

docket no 4909 Dt 11-5-08.

Calls for additional information on the subject.

151 From,

The same officer,

Letter no 253 Dt 27-1-09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5-05

Serial
No.

Subordinate Officers etc. on the
Subject

It is reported that the Shahar
Amal Diary is being maintained
in the Bettada Samudhu from
26th October 1845 and that the Shanbhogue
of the Sri Narasimhaswamy temple
writes it which is signed by both
the Shanbhogue and the Sarpatteger.

The Shanbhogue and the Sarpatteger
both depose that the 3 persons
are entitled to the manyada - the
Sarpatteger states that if there
were any additions or omissions
in the entry, they were merely
some corrections made without
any bad intention. The Dy Asstt Commr
states that he relieved the Sarpatteger
of his duties by granting him
one year's leave.

Submitted for orders

AV
31/3/09

AV 31/3/09 Which are the two reports referred to in the Dy Commr's first letter?

AV

3/4/1909

The two reports referred to in
the Dy. Commissioner's first letter.

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—15-5-08

Serial No.

are herewith submitted for kind perusal, (Vide flags 1.2. in the linked file) these Reports were received in connection with the several complaints against Peshkar Venkataramaniah, late of the Sri Narayanaswamy temple at Melkote. The Dy Commissioner has recommended that the conduct of the Peripatteger in question and other mischievous temple servants should be severely noticed by Govt as they are pseudonymous petition-writers.

Submitted for orders

AD 6/4/09 by bhatt

Assistant to Secretary

Under Secretary's note

P. 9.

VS

The dispute is about the performance of Jada seva in Dhanurmasa. It appears that in a portion of the Dravida Prabhandha it is said that the Godda Cooks address it found in the book. In the day this portion is recited during Dhanurmasa (all the 4000 Prabandha are recited once in this month) it is usual to show Naivedyas to the Kitchen establishment of the Temple.

In the Sri Narayanaswami Temple a cook came to Bangalore before the Godda in question

GPL—50 000—18-5-08

Serial No.

written this Temple; and ~~so~~ the Cook is known Manigadas.

In the Narasimhaswami Temple there is the festival. The Cooks offer some Neivedya and are known Manigadâs.

The contention of appellant ~~Krishna~~ Srinivasa Iyengar is that it is unusual for him to offer Neivedya and be honoured.

The Parpattegars say that all the Kitchen servants offer Neivedya and are honoured and that even if appellant alone offers it is usual to show the Manigadâs to all.

The dispute first arose in December 1897 when the Parpattegar allowed Panchanada Sharmanna also to offer some Neivedya which appellant Appellant complained; and the Parpattegar to support his view said he had allowed the entries in the Shaka Amâl or Diary.

I made local enquiries here and examined some of the old Shaka Amâl and ~~the~~ Sevakula Jamâbandi Khanda books. Appellant's statement is also recorded. It is not known that the ~~family~~ has given up his original contention and I may say, that the above Servants ~~have~~ has, offering with the permission offering Neivedya and receiving honours.

There are two Cooks and two Panchanadas. Of the two Panchanadas one works a Sannidhi

566 B

Note—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

Panchanatha another alias Kuttiban Panchanatha by name. It is the right of the Kuttiban Panchanatha that is questioned. The Panchanatha Sharanna has also applied to receive certain fees for weighing one of the weights

K.S.C. The documentary evidence in the case shows that

S.S.D. in 1893 Sharanna and in 1896 the Arbor tribe have performed offices Navadaya; and that

Sub E in last Sharanna's petition he also has shown Manigadaa The entry in the Shroff Book of last has been made by ~~Somanathan~~ the Somantha

Sub F. then who has written his petition per procured by appellant

It seems true that Sharanna as at long intervals offering Navadaya and that when he often omitted to offer in last by appellant, who has regularly offering every year, objected. It also appears true that the Panchayathegar in deference to action has altered the

W/ Shroff Book of 1906

Any of the signatories of the Mahazar were before me and I ~~have~~ enquired of them. They said that with a Nelson ~~seemed~~ the ~~seemed~~ of Navaka festival should not be ~~seized~~ but that the Nelson should be performed together

As regards the merits of the case it seems true that we might say that the offerings of all the three Kittoor ~~seemed~~ may be accepted and Manigadaa Shroff to them.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5-08

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

As per the contract of the Portuguese the D.C. [illegible]
keep that number of forces as was consequent a
~~sentence~~ punishment and that the Portuguese should
be suspended the D.C. decided as they hope
report them to the that the Portuguese be done nothing
wrong, that he fined the Portuguese ~~[illegible]~~ as the
Portuguese recommended punishment of action of the Portuguese
a Portuguese court or fined him he had on the former
or have written allowance

~~The D.C. and Portuguese between the D.C. and the~~
~~[illegible]~~ The D.C. is competent to punish
the Portuguese the Government take action
himself and recommend the suspension of the
Portuguese if further interfere that the Portu-
guese to attend the State and the
punished without asking the D.C. to punish the
party and thus giving room for an obstacle that
a matter as regards which for to have already formed
a conclusion

Submitted to the Committee
Ainslie Mumaya

K.S. Garg

Please [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
474)
24/5/79
At route up above

The case may be finally dis-
posed of. A draft may be
put up to that effect ~~[illegible]~~ entering
ing what punishment the Secy
thinks is deserved - Under

Hiren

25/5/79

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5-05

Serial No. 5

591)

Draft submitted to Law Member

Advantage

U.S. Cay

We ~~Lemo~~ accept the ~~D~~ Parapaye-
fair version. Suspension
seems unsuitable after this
lapse of time -

Draft altered &
passed

27/5/9

Issue - Defence limited
to
28/5 leave

B

GPB—50,000—18-5-08

MYSORE GOVERNMENT 9726

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

No. 1603/13-[illegible] Mysore, 31-12-1907.

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Mysore Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 831 of 07-08

By Order,

[illegible]

I. C. S.

Private Secretary

to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

పెద్దమనుషులంటే యిలాగే కొత్తగా ప్రవర్తిస్తారేమో అని అనుకున్నాడు. అందరూ
ఒకవైపు అయితే ఒక్కడే ఒకవైపు అన్నట్టు ఉంది. ఎవరూ ఏమీ అనలేదు. అందరూ
చూస్తూనే ఉన్నారు. ఎవరూ ఏమీ అనలేదు. ఎవరూ ఏమీ అనలేదు. ఎవరూ ఏమీ అనలేదు.
ఎవరూ ఏమీ అనలేద

30.12.09

Mr. B. Narayana Iyengar

Muz. 1] Mag. 114-07-2

190

From

To

The Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated

Despatched 17.1.08

Received

General No. 3272
No.

Enclosure No. 2

Has the honor to forward herewith for favor of enquiry and ~~disposal~~ report memorial registered no 831/2738 dated 4th January 1908 addressed to H.H the maharaja by Srinivasiengar of Melkote complaining of the non-conduct of his servants in the Bettada Narasimhaswamy temple at the place

By order

Dft 16/1/08

Secretary

C/No 3273 GPL—3,000—19-4-07 17/1/08

Sent to the

No 431
file

Office of the [illegible]
[illegible]
Dated [illegible] 6th April

To

K. Ananthanarayana Iyer [illegible]
Secretary to the Committee [illegible]
of His Highness the Maharaja's Temple
Narayana Vilas Building
Bangalore

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 3372 dated 17.1.08 forwarding for report Memorial Regd No. 831/2738 dated 4.1.08 (herewith returned) by Srinivasaiengar of Melkote complaining of the non-conduct of his services in the Sri Yoga Narasimha Swamy Temple on the Hill at Melkote, I have the honor to submit herewith the file of vernacular papers ending with yadasti No. 188/659 dated 3/21.3.08 and to state as follows:—

2. The Vehini Seva of 5 Seers of Pongal by Vombhathu Vrithi Srinivasaiengar should have been conducted as per manual on the 6th day of every year in the Sri Yoga Narasimha Swamy Temple at Melkote. In the year 1907 it should have been

conducted on 21.12.1907.

3. The petitioner, as per manual, arranged for the conduct of his Nithiya Sevartha on the aforesaid date. Seeing that one Shamanna had also, contrary to manual, arranged for one Seer of Pongal Sevartha on the same day, the petitioner brought the matter to the notice of the temple Parpathegar who asked him to represent it to the temple Peshkar and the Deputy Amildar who happened to be there on that day. According by the petitioner informed the Peshkar and he directed the temple manegar to see that nothing contrary to manual occured and requested him to inform the same to the Parpathegar also.

4. When the Neivedya of the Nithiya Sevartha had to be performed, Shamanna was allowed to offer his 1 Seer of Pongal Sevartha, Con-trary to manual. The petitioner took objection and presented a petition to the Deputy Amildar for

for due notice being taken of the responsible temple servants and for recovery of damages from the persons at fault.

5. The Deputy Amildar called for further information from the Peshkar, satisfied himself that the petitioner's complaint was reasonable, that as personally observed by him on 21.12.1907, the Parpathegar was primarily responsible for all this complaint, that the Shaka Diary of 20.12.1906 had been tampered with by the Parpathegar by inserting newly the figure 3 after the word ೨೦೪ and changing the word "೨೨೮" into "೨೨೦೮" to justify his action and punished the Parpathegar with a fine of 0-4-0, annas two for giving room to unnecessary complaints and trouble to the petitioner and annas two for tampering with the Shaka Diary of 20.12.06.

6. It is this Sevartha which is referred to in the petitions under reply.

7. It will be observed from the records

records that after the records were called for from this office the deputy Builder has obtain
-ed a statement dated 21.2.08 from the petitioner to the effect that no further action need be taken in the matter of his com-
-plaint as the deputy Builder has already punished the Par-
-pathegar by a fine. What-
-pathegar by a fine. What-
necessity there was to obtain this statement is not clear.

8. The Parpathegar in question was punished by me with a fine of 0-8-0 in the month of December 1907 in connection with another case. He is one of the mischievous persons of the place and I have already recommended in my letters noted in the margin that suitable notice should be taken of the conduct of this Parpathe-
-gar and some others.

9. The tampering of the Shaba diary referred to above which is in the hand-writing of the Parpathegar is a grave Crimi

No	Date
274	23.12.07
387	28.2.09
	3.3.

offence viz. Forgery and the punishment inflicted by the Deputy Amildar is much too lenient and ridiculously light.

10. The conduct of the Shanegar and the Simple Parpathegar is highly reprehensible and I propose issuing orders to the Sub Divisional officer to take this as a Sungrai case and dispose of it on the evidence to be adduced on both sides. In the interim I would suggest that until the Parpathegar establishes his innocence it may be ordered that he shall be placed under suspension. His pay will be held in abeyance and the Peshkar will be ordered to be in charge of current duties in addition to his own.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

H. Thurston Rencard
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Bo. 1

for approval
Dft as proposed
S.I.L.

Muz. 1]

190

From

Asst. C. 11.2.07-4

To

The Dy. Commr
Mysore Dist

Dated

Despatched 11.5.08.

Received

General No. 4909

No.

Enclosure No. one file

Adverting to his letter
no 431 dated 6th April o
reporting on the memori
of Srinivasiengar of Melkot
in regard to the non-
conduct of his Servants
in the Bettada Narasimh
swamy temple at the pl
has the honor to requ
that the original 8
Annal
Diary up 20th December

G P L—3,000—19-9-07

said to have been tampered with by the Sanpathegar, may be submitted to this office for reference.

(2) Information is also requested on the following points:-

1) under whose authority and how long since is the Shaka Annual Diary being maintained in the temple?

2) who maintains this Register?

3) Does the Seshkar check ~~the accounts~~ it and initial ~~them~~ it daily? and

(4) what have the Seshkar, Sanpathegar and Manegar to say in the matter.

(3) The favour of a detailed report is requested.

(4) The rem. records are herewith returned for ref. and re-submission at an early date

By order
4/5/08 Dy [illegible] Secretary 4/5/08

dp 26/11

G.R.S. 29A]

Dec 1st 1907-

190 .

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy. Commr.
Mysore Dist.

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

In continuation of the marginally-noted communications from this office, has the honour to forward herewith petition registered No. D.140 dated 21st Nov. 1907 from Seeniwasiengar of Melkote praying for a speedy disposal of his case relating to the alleged non-concern of his Senas in the Bettada Narasimha Swamy temple at the place

x

Docket no 4909 Dt 11-5-1908.
Reminder no 99 Dt 8-7-1908
" — no 858 Dt 26-8-1908

GPB—10,000—9-4-06.

To request that as
this year's Sena is to come
off on the 20th of next
month, the report already
called for may be submitted
without further delay.

By order
Sd/-
for Secretary

D7109(1)

1908-09

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No 253

No.

Enclosure No 1 & bile

Refer

29.1.09

P. 5/3/09

No. 253
Enc. No. 1 & file.

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner

MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore Camp 27th January 1909.

To
K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer
.....Esq., B.A. B.L.
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Inungrai Branch.

Sir,

Adverting to your docket No. 4909 dated 11.5.1908 calling for further report regarding the memorial of Srinivasiengar of Melkote in the matter of the non-conduct of his Devasthas in the Narasimha Swamy temple at Melkote, I have the honor to state as follows:—

2. As called for in para 1 of the docket under reply the Shaka Annual Diary of 20.12.06 is herewith submitted in original. (Magisr)

3. The Deputy Amildar reports that the Shaka Annual Diary is maintained in the Bettada Samnidhi from 26th October 1875; that as ordered by the Sub Divisional officer in 1881 the Shaka Diary was being maintained in the Sri Narayana Swamy Temple and Narasimha Swamy temple and copies thereof were being

submitted

submitted to the Amildar; that subsequently the practice of maintaining this diary in the Sri Narayana Swamy temple and submitting a copy of it to the Amildar was put a stop to; that the Shaka Diary was however continued to be written in the Sri Narasimha Swamy temple but the practice of sending a copy of it to the Amildar was also put a stop to some years ago, and that the Shaka diaries of the Narasimha Swamy temple from 1895 are being filed in the temple records.

4. It is understood that the Shanbhogue of the Narasimha Swamy temple writes the diary which is signed by both the Shanbhogue and the Parpathegar.

5. The Peshkar is reported to check and initial the diary daily. For 10 or 11 months the Shanbhogue of the temple failed to take the diaries to the Peshkar and the Deputy Amildar having noticed it is reported to have punished the Shanbhogue with a fine.

6. The Shanbhogue states that the 3 persons are entitled to the mariyadai

Hanger)

mariyadas even if one performs the Seva, that on 20.12.06 the daily work was written by him while the Kelikurkalle was entered by the Parpathegar and that the omission was supplied by the Parpathegar on that date.

The Parpathegar states that as per manual all the 3 were entitled to the mariyadas and if there were any omissions or additions in the entry he either supplied or rectified them and that the correction were made by him on the same date without any bad intention. (Page

The Peshkar states that the Parpathegar made a subsequent entry (Vide report No 1546 dated 3.6.08 and yadi No 703 dated 23.12.07). (Flag T

7 The Deputy Amildar reports that he noticed that the Shanbhogue and the Parpathegar formed one faction while the Archak and Srinivasiengar formed another; that consequently the temple work suffered and that he had therefore to punish the Parpathegar with a fine of 0-6-0 (Flag S

He further reports that in view to put a stop to this spirit of dissatisfaction

dissatisfaction and to ensure good work in the temple he has no other alternative but to relieve the perpatuegar of his duties by granting him one year's leave

8. The petition received with your docket No 340 dated 30.11.08 Emg 104-08-2 and the file of papers bearing on the subject are herewith submitted for reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

A Macgregor Clerk
for Deputy Commr
Mysore District

Hs.

Read:—

Petn no 831/2738 dy 4th Jany 1908 addressed to H.H. the Maharaja by Srinivasayya of Melkote complaining of the non-conduct of his Levanthas in the Bettada Narasimhaswami temple at the place.

Correspondence ending with letter no 253 dy 27th Jany 1909 from the Dy Commr Mysore Dt reporting on the above.

Order thereon:—

Petitioner Srinivasayya is a cook attached to the Sri Narasimhaswamy

No 2034 dt
Mus F 142-07-6
29.5.09.
Enl file

al-Melkote. ~~He contends~~ Says

that on the Thada Utsavam

day during Dhanurmasa

it has been usual for him

to offer Pongal as Nehimi Levartha

and in return to be ~~honored~~ shown some Mariyadi;

~~proceeded with Thirtha and Mala~~,

and that in December 1907 Complains

the Parpattegar of the temple

contrary to this manual

allowed Parichanak Shamanna

of this temple also to offer

Pongal as Nehimi Levartha.

The Parpattegar and Shamanna

say that it is the manual

for the three Kitchen Servants

Viz- the two Cooks & the Parichanak -

to offer Nehimi Levartha

and to be shown Mariyadis in return.

In support of this contention, the Parpattegar made some alterations in the entry of the Temple Shaka Anual of Dec. 1906. The D. comm. in submitting the records proposed that the conduct of the Parpattegar should be suitably noticed.

2. The Nurzai Superintt after holding a local enquiry and examining available documents has noted that the Kitchen Servants also have often offered Nahimi Levantha and been shown Maniyades in return and that the contention of the petr is

untenable. Govt. accept-
the Mysore Superintt's conclusions
and direct that in future
the Nehinni Levantha may
be presented by all the three
Servants and they shown
the usual Marriyadès in return.
It must however be distinctly
understood that none of
the three Servants can be shown
Marriyade without offering
Nehinni Levantha.

3. As regards the
conduct of the Parpatyegar
Govt are ~~clearly~~ Satisfied
that he has tampered with the
entry in the temple Shaka Annal
of Dec 1906. He has not offered
any satisfactory explanation
when questioned by the Deputy Commissioner.
The fine of 4 annas is, as expressed

3. The Dy Cr might
himself have awarded
what he considered
as suitable punish-
ment for the act
of the Parpatyegar
in tampering with
the diary of the tem-
ple. But since
the matter has
come up before
Govt, it is

ನಂ

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mcz. 21

ನಂ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ

ಗಡಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ವಿವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ
ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು
ಸಮನ್ವಯ ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಕಾರದಿಂದ ಪರಿಹರಿಸಬೇಕು
ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲಹೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.
ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು
ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

By order,

Sd/-
for Secretary.